

REMARKS

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed December 6, 2005, Applicant provisionally elects the claims of Group II, without traverse. However, the Examiner is requested to reconsider his Restriction Requirement because all groups of claims are drawn to subject matter which are so related to each other that an undue burden would not be placed upon the Examiner by maintaining both groups of claims in a single application. See, e.g., MPEP § 803.

Claim 26 has been amended to read better but should not be considered a limiting amendment.

Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 29, 2005

HARNES, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382